13th December 1954]

SRI M. NARAYANA KURUP :—" Sir, it was more than once stated on the floor of this House that the matter was under the consideration, under the very active consideration of the Government. Now the Hon. Minister says that it is under consideration. May I know what happened to change the attitude of this Government? "

THE HON. SRI S. S. RAMASAMY PADAYACHI :—" There is no change in the attitude of the Government. It is still under the consideration of the Government."

SRI K. V. RAMASWAMI :—" ஸார், 'தாலூகா போர்டுகளைப் புதுப்பிக்கப்போகிறோம்' என்று சர்க்கார் ஜில்லா போர்டு தேர்தலுக்கு முன்னதாக சொல்லிக்கொண்டிருந்தார்கள். ஆனால், இப்பொழுது அப்படிச் சொல்வது இல்லை. அதற்குக் காரணம் என்ன ? ஜில்லா போர்டு தேர்தலில் மேஜாரிடி கிடைத்துவிட்டதால் சார்க்கார் இப்பொழுது அப்படிச் சொல்வதில்லையா ? "

THE HON. SRI S. S. RAMASAMY PADAYACHI :—" ஸார். மலபார் ஜில்லா போர்டைப் பாதிக்கும் என்பதற்காக ஒத்திவைக்கப் பட்டிருக்கிறது."

SRI T. C. NARAYANAN NAMBIAR :—" Is the suggestion to constitute Taluk Boards an alternative to the present District Boards or are they in addition to the present District Boards for more democratic administration of local affairs? "

MR. SPEAKER :—" The matter is under consideration. The hon. Member is going into details. If the Hon. Minister is prepared to answer the question I have no objection."

*Reinstatement of persons dismissed from service in Pudukkottai.*

* 253 *Q*.—SRI V. BALAKRISHNAN : Will the Hon. the Minister for Finance be pleased to state— 11-30 a.m.

(*a*) whether any persons dismissed or removed from service by the former Pudukkottai State several years antecedent to the merger have been reinstated or such orders revoked by the Madras Government after the merger; and

(*b*) if so, the reasons therefor?

THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM :—" (*a*) & (*b*) The attention of the hon. Member is invited to the answer given to the Legislative Assembly starred question No. 1047 printed on pages 1346–47 of the Proceedings of the Assembly, Volume IX, No. 11, dated 25th July 1953. (Laughter.) That question was put by the very same hon. Member. There are no other cases."